UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

VALENTINO JOHNSON,

Defendant.

Case No. 14-cr-00412-TEH

ORDER RE: HEARING ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SEVER

Counsel shall come prepared to address the following questions at the April 20, 2015 hearing on Defendant's motion to sever:

For Prosecution

- 1. Would the January 2015 phone calls be admissible in an obstruction proceeding, even though they are outside the timeframe provided in the Superseding Indictment?
- 2. What is the import of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(g) on Defendant's intended testimony about the obstruction charge? Must Defendant have "foreseen" a federal proceeding when he engaged in obstructive conduct?
- 3. To what extent will the Government have to re-litigate whether Defendant is guilty of possession in a separate obstruction trial?
- 4. How would the proposed criminal history stipulation affect the Government's case regarding the armed career criminal enhancement?
- 5. How does the Government respond to Defendant's concern about the prejudicial nature of evidence relating to the 2011 homicide and 2014 burglary?

	8
	9
Northern District of California	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18 19
	20
	20 21
	22
	222324
	24

25

26

27

28

T7	D.C.		4
HAT	Defe	na	ดทร

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

- 1. In this case, why is it not possible for an obstruction trial to take place before a possession trial (e.g., what if motions toll the Speedy Trial Act as to the possession count)?
- 2. Can the Parties edit the jailhouse calls to minimize the jury's exposure to the more graphic elements of these conversations?
- 3. What is the import of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(g) on Defendant's intended testimony about the obstruction charge? Must Defendant have "foreseen" the federal proceeding, or need the proceeding only have been objectively foreseeable?
- 4. If the Parties stipulate to Defendant's criminal history, why does this not resolve the spillover effect concerns raised in the motion?
- 5. Can the Court minimize the prejudice of evidence relating to the 2011 homicide and 2014 burglary through jury instructions and/or motions in limine?

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 04/17/15

United States District Judge